

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>ANDREY YUDENKO,</b>	:	<b>CIVIL ACTION</b>
<b>Plaintiff</b>	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>NO. 06-4161</b>
	:	
<b>VINCENT GUARINI, ET AL.,</b>	:	
<b>Defendants</b>	:	

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of July, 2009, upon consideration of defendants' motion in limine to bar evidence and testimony concerning plaintiff's immigration status (Document #67), as well as defendants' response thereto, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the motion is **GRANTED**.<sup>1</sup> Defendants shall introduce no evidence of plaintiff's immigration status at trial.

BY THE COURT:

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Lawrence F. Stengel

LAWRENCE F. STENGEL, J.

---

<sup>1</sup>In the defendants' response, they argue that plaintiff's "immigration status and concomitant ability to work legally within the United States is relevant" if "plaintiff is permitted to make a wage loss claim." Def. Mem. at 5. As plaintiff has stated that he will not make a wage loss claim at trial, his immigration status will not be relevant. In the unlikely event that plaintiff attempts to introduce wage loss evidence, defendants will be permitted to renew their objection to the exclusion of his immigration status.